

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-13 are now in the application. Claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 2, 5, 6, and 9 have been amended.

Requirement for Information

In the Office Action the Examiner required a citation of references for information discussed in the Background of the Invention. Applicants have no specific references and no prior art search was made. The only art cited is a personal digital assistant (PDA) with a mute button; such devices are well-known. The requirement for information should be withdrawn.

Objection to Drawings

In the Office Action the Examiner also objected to Figs. 1, 2 and 3 saying the figures require the legend "Prior Art". However, these figures do not represent prior art. These figures represent implementations of the invention. Fig. 1 shows a PDA with a display screen having a menu with a plurality of notification modes in accordance with the invention. Fig. 2 represents a computing system for implementing the inventive operations of FIGs. 4-9. Fig. 3 illustrates the software for implementing the inventive operations in FIGs. 4-9. Accordingly, Figs. 1, 2 and 3 are provided in the application to show an implementation of the invention and provide an enabling disclosure for the invention. The objection to the drawings as being prior art should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Treyz et al. (USPN 6,587,835).

Claim 1 has been canceled, and claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form incorporating the elements of original claims 1 and 2. Also, independent claim 6 has been amended to refer to more than one profile. Thus, claims 2 and 6 are directed to storing a plurality of profiles of notification events, notifying a user of an event according to a stored profile with each profile associated with a notification mode, receiving a selection for a notification mode, and applying the selected notification mode.

The Treyz reference does not perform the combination of (1) storing more than one profile, (2) selecting a notification mode associated with a profile, and (3) applying the selected

notification mode. Treyz has notification events and types as shown in FIGs. 69 and 70, but Treyz does not describe notification modes and does not associate each profile with a notification mode. In other words FIG. 69 could be said to represent one profile, but Treyz does not store simultaneous profiles for a single user or single remote computing device. Further Treyz does not allow a user to select a profile (one profile per notification mode) from a plurality of profiles and apply that profile (notification mode). Claims 2 and 6 should be allowed.

Claims 3-5 that depend from claim 2 and claims 7-8 that depend from claim 6 should be allowed for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 6.

Claim 9 already stored a plurality of profiles, but it has been amended to also refer to using a selected profile to determine whether to notify. Thus, claim 9 distinguishes over the Treyz reference in a manner similar to that discussed for claims 2 and 6 above. Claim 9 should be allowed.

Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and should be allowed for the same reasons as discussed above for claim 9.

Conclusion

As all claims in the application are in condition for allowance, Applicants request the application be allowed and passed to issuance as soon as possible.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5 January 2004





Homer L. Knearl, #21,197
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1633